



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups




BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



Table of Content

Introduction	2
Chapter One: Why This Matters – Public Health & Corporate Accountability	3
The Doctrine of Informed Consent	3
Why Informed Consent Was Not Observed During the Pandemic	4
Silenced Alternative Treatments	5
<i>Scott Schara</i>	7
<i>Dr. Henry Ealy</i>	8
The U.S. Constitutional First Amendment Right to a Free Press & Speech	9
Your First Amendment Right	9
The Freedom to Voice Concerns on Vaccine-induced Injuries & Death	9
Driven by Profit, Not Altruism: How Much Did They Earn?	10
The COVID Pandemic Drives Pfizer's 2022 Revenue to a Record \$100 Billion	10
Moderna Reports Surprise Profit on Higher-Than-Expected COVID Vaccine Sales	10
AstraZeneca Revenues Soar with Nearly \$4bn in COVID-19 Vaccine Sales	11
<i>Dr. Henry Ealy</i>	11
Where are the Public Authorities & What Did they Gain?	12
Dr. Anthony Fauci Held Publicly Accountable by Select Subcommittee	12
Fauci and Wife's Net Worth Exceeded \$11 Million During Pandemic	13
Dr. Fauci's Top Advisor [Dr. Morens] Held Accountable for COVID-19 Federal Records Violations	13
<i>Dr. Peter McCullough</i>	14
Chapter Two: Lawsuits Against Vaccine Manufacturers – Their Alibis & Defenses	15
Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) as an Alibi Against Liability	15
Lawsuits Against the COVID-19 AstraZeneca Vaccine	16
AstraZeneca Faces Legal Challenge Over COVID-19 Vaccine	16
Patients Launch Legal Action against AstraZeneca over its COVID-19 Vaccine	16
Lawsuits Against the COVID-19 Pfizer Vaccine	17






BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Kansas Accuses Pfizer of Misleading Public About COVID Vaccine in Lawsuit	17
Attorney General Ken Paxton Sues Pfizer for Misrepresenting COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy and Conspiring to Censor Public Discourse	18
<i>Warner Mendenhall</i>	18
Chapter Three: Silencing Truth: How Mass Media & the Government Suppressed Information	21
Government-imposed Control and Censorship	21
Government Censors Victims of COVID Vaccine Injuries. NCLA is Fighting Back	21
The White House COVID Censorship Machine	22
Information Isolation: Censoring the COVID-19 Outbreak	23
Censoring Information Contrary to the Narrative	23
Imprisoning the Opposition	24
<i>Leigh Dundas</i>	24
Chapter Four: Judicial Victory – Court Decisions Against Vaccine Mandates	27
U.S. Supreme Court Votes AGAINST OSHA Rule: The Mandatory Vaccine Rule	27
What is the OSHA Emergency Rule?	27
Non-Compliance Resulted in Termination of Employment	27
What Did the U.S. Supreme Court Decide?	28
Why Workers Fired for Refusing COVID Vaccines are Starting to Win in Court	28
Queensland Supreme Court Declared Certain C-19 Vaxx Mandates Unlawful	28
What was the Case About?	28
The Main Issue Presented	29
How did the High Court Rule?	29
<i>Graham Hood</i>	30
Conclusion	33



The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking up, with medical equipment visible in the background. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the Roman goddess Iustitia, holding a scale of justice and a sword.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Introduction

"Public Office is Public Trust." A person who holds a public position of authority is liable to their constituents to provide a fair, just, and transparent governance of the people, for the people, and by the people. Of course, good governance includes taking good care of its people's health.

The COVID-19 pandemic ushered in an era of unprecedented challenges, not only for global health but also for public trust in medical and governmental institutions. Among the most contentious issues has been the deployment of COVID-19 vaccines.

Undeniably, the COVID-19 vaccines have been linked to adverse events, including severe injuries and deaths. This book will dive into the complex web of legal battles and controversies surrounding vaccine injuries, the pharmaceutical companies that manufactured them, and the governments that endorsed their widespread use.

Adding to the controversy is the troubling reality that some public officials and health authorities abused their positions of trust, exploiting their power to advance the vaccine agenda while knowing of its potential detrimental effects – we'll discuss this more later in the book.

Driven by financial incentives and under the influence of pharmaceutical companies, they promoted vaccine mandates and mass rollouts without ensuring informed consent. Instead of safeguarding the public, they prioritized profits and

The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking up, with medical equipment visible. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the law, holding scales of justice.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

political expediency, leaving countless individuals unaware of the full risks they were assuming.

Many individuals and families have turned to the legal system for answers and accountability. Lawsuits against vaccine manufacturers are shedding light on troubling allegations: **insufficient safety testing**, **concealed data on side effects**, and a regulatory process that **prioritized speed over transparency**.

At the heart of these claims is the assertion that governments and vaccine manufacturers engaged in a coordinated effort to downplay risks and shield themselves from liability.

Through a detailed examination of legal documents, whistleblower testimonies, and expert analyses, this book will reveal the extent to which public trust has been betrayed. It also explores the broader implications of this alleged cover-up, from the erosion of medical ethics to the challenges facing injured parties seeking justice in a system stacked against them.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Chapter One: Why This Matters – Public Health & Corporate Accountability

The legalities surrounding the COVID-19 vaccine are not just for attorneys, corporations, or regulators. More importantly, these are matters that we, as private citizens, should be immensely concerned about, as they affect our fundamental rights, livelihood, and more importantly, our health.

Failing to understand the legal and ethical issues behind the COVID-19 vaccine coverup could lead to a repeat of the same mistakes in future crises. Ignorance enables complacency, allowing the government and the private industry to evade scrutiny and accountability.

A well-informed public can demand higher standards, hold wrongdoers accountable, and advocate for systemic changes that benefit everyone.

The question is – do you have a right to be informed? And, more importantly, do you have the right to free speech to redress your grievances to the government for vaccine-related injuries and death?

The Doctrine of Informed Consent

According to the American Medical Association (AMA), informed consent refers to the **ethical and legal obligation** of healthcare providers to **disclose all relevant information** about a proposed treatment, **including its risks, benefits, and alternatives**, enabling patients to make a voluntary and informed decision about their care.

The failure of healthcare providers to disclose relevant information constitutes medical negligence resulting in a breach of the physician-patient relationship.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Why Informed Consent Was Not Observed During the Pandemic

Informed consent was notably absent during the COVID-19 pandemic. It requires that patients receive **comprehensive, truthful information** about a treatment's risks, benefits, and alternatives, empowering them to make voluntary and informed decisions. Yet, during the pandemic, this principle was overshadowed by fear-driven narratives, withheld information, and coercive practices, undermining public trust and individual autonomy.

One of the primary factors that contributed was the **pervasive climate of fear**.

Public health messaging and media coverage portrayed COVID-19 as an apocalyptic threat, with vaccines framed as the sole solution. Alternative treatments, many of which had shown promise in early trials or anecdotal evidence, were systematically discredited, censored, or outright banned.

Patients were not presented with viable options, **creating a false dichotomy that vaccines were their only hope**. This suppression of alternatives left the public unable to make fully informed decisions, as critical information was intentionally excluded.

Further, vaccine manufacturers failed to provide full disclosure of potential risks. Early concerns about side effects, such as blood clots and myocarditis, were **dismissed as misinformation, only to be acknowledged later under legal pressure or court testimony**.

This withholding and subsequent admission of risks not only violated transparency and honesty but also eroded the trust necessary for informed consent. Patients were unknowingly exposed to dangers that were minimized or denied by the very entities charged with ensuring their safety.

Adding to this breach of trust were **coercive measures imposed on the public**. Many individuals were **compelled to take the vaccines under the threat of losing their jobs**, access to education, or ability to participate in daily life. This lack

The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking towards the camera. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the law, holding a scale of justice and a sword.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

of voluntary choice contradicts informed consent, which requires decisions to be made free from undue pressure or coercion.

In essence, informed consent was replaced by a system of compliance, where autonomy and personal rights were sacrificed in the name of public health.

In sum, the combination of fear-mongering, suppression of alternatives, lack of transparency, and coercion not only undermined the individual's right to make informed decisions but also set a dangerous precedent for future public health crises.

Silenced Alternative Treatments

Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) is an anti-malarial medication that has been in use for decades. It is primarily used to treat malaria and autoimmune conditions such as lupus and rheumatoid arthritis.

HCQ gained attention during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic due to its potential to treat the disease. Several studies suggested that HCQ could inhibit the replication of the SARS-CoV-2 virus by blocking viral entry into human cells. In addition to its direct antiviral effects.

HCQ also has immune-modulating properties which help reduce the hyper-inflammatory response in severe cases of COVID-19. Early reports from physicians, particularly in countries like France and China, claimed that HCQ showed promise in reducing symptoms and improving patient outcomes in COVID-19 patients.

Why was HCQ silenced? The public health response during the early stages of the pandemic was focused on the rapid development and deployment of vaccines as the primary solution to the crisis. **HCQ, as an existing and relatively inexpensive treatment, was seen as a potential competitor to the vaccine narrative.**

The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, appearing to be asleep or resting, with medical equipment visible in the background. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the law, holding a scale of justice and a sword.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

The widespread use of HCQ would have **required less profit and less control by pharmaceutical companies** compared to the new vaccine development efforts, which were highly profitable.

Ivermectin is an antiparasitic drug that has been used for decades to treat a range of conditions, including river blindness (onchocerciasis), scabies, head lice, and other parasitic infections. It works by disrupting the nervous system of parasites, leading to their paralysis and death.

It is widely considered a safe and effective treatment for parasitic diseases and has been **included on the World Health Organization's List of Essential Medicines**, which highlights the most important medications needed in a basic health system.

During the pandemic, Ivermectin attracted attention as a potential treatment for the SARS-CoV-2 virus after laboratory studies showed that **it could inhibit the virus's replication in cell cultures**.

It also had **anti-inflammatory properties which could help control the body's inflammatory response during COVID-19**. This is important, as a severe COVID-19 infection can lead to an overactive immune response, called a cytokine storm, which can cause significant damage to the lungs and other organs.

Why was Ivermectin Silenced? Similar to HCQ, ivermectin was **seen as a competitor to the global vaccine rollout and other pharmaceutical interventions**. Since it was already an established, low-cost generic medication, its widespread use could have posed a threat to the profits of pharmaceutical companies that stood to gain from vaccines and other treatments. This created a scenario where health authorities and media outlets, often influenced by pharmaceutical interests, were quick to discredit Ivermectin and suppress its use in favor of more profitable solutions.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Vitamin C, also known as ascorbic acid, is a water-soluble vitamin that is essential for many bodily functions. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, Vitamin C garnered attention for its role in supporting immune health, reducing inflammation, and mitigating the severity of viral infections, including COVID-19.

It can enhance the production and function of white blood cells, which are responsible for fighting infections and can stimulate the production of interferons, which are proteins that help protect cells from viral infections.

Why was Vitamin C silenced? Being a well-known and widely available supplement, it was often discussed in the media alongside other potential treatments, some of which were viewed as controversial or unproven. This led to the idea that Vitamin C was being used as part of unverified, alternative approaches to treating COVID-19.

As global focus shifted toward vaccine development and distribution, the emphasis on other supportive measures, including nutrition, vitamins, and supplements, took a backseat. Although Vitamin C is vital for maintaining a healthy immune system, it did not fit into the mainstream narrative of vaccine-focused prevention strategies. This relegated Vitamin C's potential benefits to the fringes, even though there was considerable public interest and demand for alternative or complementary treatments.

Scott Schara

"This one is about informed consent. So we're of the mindset that we have informed consent. Informed consent was written by God. He said, "Treat your neighbor as yourself." So then when you get to informed consent in a hospital setting, what should that look like? If you and I were doctors - I'll tell you what it looks like.

You would want your patient to know what's going on. So anything that would impact the patient, you want to sit down with the patient and have a discussion, and talk about, here's the pros, cons, alternatives, risks, benefits, etc. So then the patient is informed. And then you would never put pressure on the patient.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

You would say, "Now with everything I've said to you, take time and process it. Look some things up on the internet. If you have some friends or doctors outside, call them, get their perspective. And then, if we can set up a time later on today or tomorrow to determine if you want to go forward or not." That's what I'd like to do. That's informed consent.

Informed consent is completely gone in our society, and unfortunately, it's legally gone. On the 21st of December of 2023, the Health and Human Services Department and the FDA issued a final ruling to amend the 2016 Cures Act to take informed consent away from us.

So we have this illusion that we have informed consent, and I just shared with you the proof that informed consent is gone, and you have to take the matter into your own hands. And then I'm going to share two more things.

I believe God prophesied about what's happening today in Revelation 18:23. In Revelation 18:23 He said, "For your merchants, we're the most important people of the earth because with the language is sorcery." But when you look at sorcery in the Greek, it's pharmakeia, because with your pharmakeia, they deceived all nations. And, if you look back at the original Hippocratic Oath, Hippocrates lived in about 500 BC, and if you read that oath, you will see Satan telling us what he is going to do. And God prophesied this was going to happen. That's why I believe COVID was a call to repentance."

Dr. Henry Ealy

"In every single person who elected to get the experimental shots, informed consent has not been reached once. Why? Because of the false statements, because of the lies, because of the fraudulent data. Not once has informed consent been achieved for anyone who elected to participate in this ongoing human experiment.

The largest human experiment in history is underway right now, and it is dangerous and they have opened Pandora's box. So, what did the CDC tell us, and what did the gene therapy manufacturers tell us as well? What did they tell us? That the mRNA sequence once injected would erode very quickly, would be broken down by enzymatic action very



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

quickly, therefore they need a lipid nanoparticle around it to preserve it and get it into the cell. This is the first thing they said.

The concern becomes at that point, well, if it's in a lipid bubble, it's going to have an affinity for other fatty tissues, liver, reproductive organs, nervous system, especially the central nervous system. They said, "No, it's going to be administered into the arm, it's intermuscular, it's going to be uptaken very quickly by the myocytes and by epithelial cells and things like that. It can't possibly get to these other very delicate tissues, liver, reproductive organs, central nervous system."

And then Japan in 2021 showed that, no, it could. Japan is one of the only countries I know of that does their own independent analysis on all of these so-called vaccines, these gene therapy shots.

They showed conclusively that the mRNA sequences have an affinity for fat tissue, which makes that very concerning. The next thing we were told by the CDC was that the mRNA sequences, once uploaded into a cell, would only co-opt the ribosomal sub-units to make the spike protein in those cells.

Well, if that's an epithelial cell, like a skin cell, no problem, those cells turn over so quickly, no big deal, right? The problem becomes when it uploads into a neuron, the problem is when it uploads into reproductive cells, the problem is when it uploads into liver cells, the problem is when it uploads into immune cells."

The U.S. Constitutional First Amendment Right to a Free Press & Speech

Your First Amendment Right

The First Amendment provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting its free exercise. It protects **freedom of speech, the press, assembly, and the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.**

Why is this important?



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

The First Amendment's protection of free speech and a free press is fundamental to preserving the rights of individuals to seek redress from the government and share their grievances with society.

The Freedom to Voice Concerns on Vaccine-induced Injuries & Death

This right is particularly crucial for those who have suffered vaccine injuries or lost loved ones due to vaccination. The **ability to freely communicate these experiences allows individuals to petition the government for justice** and advocate for necessary policy changes.

Without the freedom to speak openly, those affected may find it nearly impossible to hold public institutions accountable or to ensure that their voices are heard in shaping decisions that impact public health and safety.

In the digital age, social media platforms have become the primary venues for public discourse, enabling individuals to share videos, photos, and personal testimonies about vaccine injuries and deaths. **Attempts to censor such content not only infringe upon the First Amendment but also erode the public's ability to engage in open dialogue about matters of significant public concern.**

This form of suppression can isolate individuals, prevent the formation of support networks, and hinder efforts to raise awareness about vaccine-related issues. Protecting the right to share these experiences online is essential for ensuring that marginalized voices are not silenced and that critical discussions about public health remain transparent and inclusive.

As the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, particularly the First Amendment, takes precedence over conflicting statutes, regulations, or policies that may be enacted by Congress or implemented by government agencies.

Policies or actions that suppress speech about vaccine injuries are subordinate to the First Amendment's mandate. The right to speak freely, especially on matters that question governmental policies, is a cornerstone of accountability and progress.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



Driven by Profit, Not Altruism: How Much Did They Earn?

Pharmaceutical companies such as Pfizer, Moderna, and AstraZeneca, made substantial profits from vaccine sales, which were guaranteed by massive government contracts and global demand.

These companies secured billions in advance orders even before the clinical trials were completed, indicating that the financial aspect of vaccine distribution was a driving force from the very start.

These companies also received quick approval processes and emergency use authorizations, allowing them to bypass traditional regulatory timelines, and charge governments, health organizations, and the public for vaccines often at prices that ensured substantial returns.

But how much did they actually earn?

[The COVID Pandemic Drives Pfizer's 2022 Revenue to a Record \\$100 Billion](#)

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly boosted Pfizer's revenue, **pushing it to a record \$100 billion in 2022**. Of this, nearly \$57 billion was attributed to its COVID vaccine and the antiviral pill Paxlovid, according to the company's report.

The vaccine itself contributed \$37.8 billion, marking a modest 3% increase from 2021 as demand for the shots began to decline. However, the sales of Paxlovid more than compensated for this slowdown, with the antiviral treatment generating \$18.9 billion in its first full year on the market.



The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking up, with medical equipment visible. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the law, holding scales of justice.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Combined, the revenue from the vaccine and antiviral pill surpassed Pfizer's total sales from 2019, a year before the pandemic reshaped the world, causing millions of deaths and disrupting global markets.

[Moderna Reports Surprise Profit on Higher-Than-Expected COVID Vaccine Sales](#)

On November 7, Moderna reported a surprise third-quarter profit, driven by stronger-than-expected sales of its COVID-19 vaccine. The company's shares rose nearly 5% to \$54.22 in early trading. Sales of its Spikevax COVID vaccine reached \$1.8 billion, marking a 3.5% increase from the previous year and surpassing analysts' expectations of \$1.38 billion.

Moderna's third-quarter sales for 2021 revealed extraordinary profits from its COVID-19 vaccine. It reported sales in the third-quarter totalling \$5 billion, with total sales for 2021 expected to reach up to \$18 billion, driven largely by its mRNA COVID-19 vaccine.

[AstraZeneca Revenues Soar with Nearly \\$4bn in COVID-19 Vaccine Sales](#)

AstraZeneca reported a 38% increase in its revenues for 2021, driven largely by the success of its COVID-19 vaccine, Vaxzevria, which generated \$3.9 billion in sales.

AstraZeneca shifted to a for-profit model in November 2021, expecting to achieve "modest profitability" from the vaccine as the pandemic continued. This transition marked a significant change in the company's approach, contributing to its strong financial performance and setting the stage for higher sales in 2022.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Dr. Henry Ealy

"There is money behind this. Pfizer in 2022 quarter three, just one quarter, one 3-month period made \$22.6 billion. \$22.6 billion. What's the biggest portfolio they have in terms of their earning potential?"

You're right, these damn shots. There is a financial incentive to not tell the truth. And when there is a financial incentive to not tell the truth, the truth will have a damn hard time putting on its shoes and making its way around the world as Mark Twain might say.

What we have to have the courage to do is to hold people accountable whether we like them or not, to the same standard. And that standard is the light of God's eternal truth. Now, when we look at something like this, what it ultimately takes me to is 42 USC 300aa and specifically provisions -11, -22, and -15.

If you haven't gotten a feeling by now that I know what I'm talking about, I hope you go and check everything I say because I can back up everything that I've shared thus far. 42 USC 300aa is the 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act. -11 and -22 clauses state conclusively that you can't sue a company that is raking in 22 billion every 3 months.

You can't sue them when they injure or kill your child. -15 is an abomination before Americans and life itself because you know what -15 says, 42 USC 300aa -15 says that a baby's life, if a baby gets one of these damn shots, any shots, not just COVID and dies, that baby is worth \$250,000.

We haven't had a price tag on human life published in our laws since June 15th, 1865, slavery. But in 1986, Henry Waxman, Democrat, California got this pushed through somehow. Oh my God, we have to protect these poor pharmaceutical companies that might go out of business because their products are injuring and killing people.

And if we allow this to happen, moms and dads will sue them into oblivion. Yeah, that's what's supposed to happen when you produce a product that claims to be safe and effective, but in reality, causes injury and death.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

That's what's supposed to happen. A mom or a dad who's lost their kid or is now going to deal with a lifetime of injuries should be able to sue these companies. There's no argument. I don't care what side of the fence somebody's on relative to vaccines. I don't care if you're pro or anti. I don't care if you're an idiot pro-vaxxer or if you're an intelligent anti-vaxxer, I don't care where you are on it.

We have to all agree that no company should have this kind of immunity. But here we are. We are here because we've allowed the maturation of the Nazi agenda to take hold in the United States. We are here because we have placed imaginary numbers called money over real-world life in the people that we love. And we're here because of apathy that this is somebody else's problem until it's ours."

Where are the Public Authorities & What Did They Gain?

[Dr. Anthony Fauci Held Publicly Accountable by Select Subcommittee](#)

Dr. Anthony Fauci has faced significant scrutiny for his policies and statements during the COVID-19 pandemic, yet he has shown no indication of regret for the widespread impact of his decisions. He has not issued an apology to the countless Americans who lost their jobs for refusing the newly introduced vaccine, nor to the children who suffered severe learning setbacks as a result of policies he endorsed.

During recent proceedings, Dr. Fauci confirmed that his Senior Advisor, Dr. David Morens, violated National Institutes of Health (NIH) policies and breached federal law.

Evidence obtained by the Select Subcommittee indicates that **Dr. Morens obstructed the investigation into the origins of COVID-19**, unlawfully **deleted federal records related to the pandemic**, and shared confidential information regarding NIH grant processes with Dr. Peter Daszak, President of EcoHealth Alliance.

In deleting the federal records pertaining to the pandemic, what were they trying to accomplish or hide?



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Dr. Fauci continued to assert that the NIH did not fund gain-of-function research in Wuhan, China, repeating the same claim he made in 2021 during a discussion with Senator Rand Paul.

However, former Acting NIH Director Dr. Lawrence Tabak recently testified that **the NIH did, in fact, fund gain-of-function research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology**. Despite this contradiction, Dr. Fauci maintained his stance during the hearing.

[Fauci and Wife's Net Worth Exceeded \\$11 Million During Pandemic](#)

Dr. Anthony Fauci and his wife had a combined net worth exceeding \$11 million when Fauci stepped down from his government position in December 2022.

Adam Andrzejewski, CEO of Open the Books, highlighted a significant increase in their net worth during the pandemic. *"At the end of 2021, during the height of the pandemic, **their net worth had surged to approximately \$12.6 million from \$7.6 million—a \$5 million jump**,"* Andrzejewski explained.

Federal ethics filings revealed that Dr. Fauci, alongside his wife, Dr. Christine Grady, who also worked at the National Institutes of Health, experienced notable financial growth during the pandemic.

"When factoring in federal benefits, the Fauci household brought in around \$1 million annually," Andrzejewski noted. He added that Fauci played a central role in shaping U.S. healthcare policies during the pandemic, while Grady contributed by conducting ethical research to support those measures, which included key initiatives like mandatory masking, economic shutdowns, and protocols for isolated patients.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

[Dr. Fauci's Top Advisor \[Dr. Morens\] Held Accountable for COVID-19 Federal Records Violations](#)

Dr. David Morens, Senior Scientific Advisor to Dr. Anthony Fauci, has faced public scrutiny for actions that have undermined US government operations. Allegations against Dr. Morens include potentially lying to Congress, **deleting federal COVID-19 records, and using his personal email account to bypass the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).**

In response to these accusations, Dr. Morens dismissed his conduct as "*dark humor*" and "*jokes*," a defense that was sharply criticized by members of both political parties.

Lawmakers rejected these explanations, highlighting what they perceived as **deliberate attempts to deflect accountability and protect his reputation.**

Additionally, Dr. Morens admitted to using personal email accounts to discuss official government business as a way to evade FOIA requests.

Dr. Peter McCullough

"We've learned through the US House Representative Select Committee for the origins of SARS-CoV-2 and Senate investigations, that former National Allergy Immunology branch director Anthony Fauci and former NIH director Francis Collins were involved. They were involved in the creation of SARS-CoV-2.

The virus apparently was created by Dr. Ralph Baric, based on his design of a chimeric bat coronavirus, so taking a bat virus and getting it to invade human beings. The plans were orchestrated by the EcoHealth Alliance, a non-government organization based out of New York City. So Baric and Peter Daszak at the EcoHealth Alliance, they collaborated. Swiss Institute was involved. Harvard National Institutes of Health.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Modest funding went to the Chinese; they didn't need funding, but the Chinese needed the plans on how to create the virus. Indeed was created in the Wuhan Institute of Virology, before the biosecurity annex was even open, so it was actually under BSL-3 conditions where the virus was created.

It was memorialized in two publications, one in Nature Proceedings and the other one in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, declaring that they had created a virus that was poised for human emergence.

And what happened from there was through 2020, there was actually an attempted coverup, and clearly into 2020, where Fauci and Collins actually held a conference call, and on it was Jeremy Farrar from the Wellcome Trust, Peter Daszak EcoHealth Alliance, multiple scientists, Kristian Andersen from Scripps, Edward Holmes from University of Sydney.

And in this conference call, Fauci and Collins really gave the directive to intentionally lead the world on a false narrative. And that narrative was that the virus actually did not come from the lab, but it rose spontaneously from nature.

There were 12 fraudulent papers published in the peer-reviewed literature and an entire media campaign to mislead the world on the origins of SARS-CoV-2. SARS-CoV-2 clearly was man-made, it was engineered. Ralph Baric of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the NIH, the Chinese Wuhan Institute of Virology; those are the culpable individuals.

Now what happened in the fall of 2019, it's speculated that the air conditioning HVAC system may have went out in parts of the lab, and the virus may have gotten out, gotten a few workers sick, and then it was spread from there. But it was clear the virus was out of the lab before Event 201.

When Event 201 was held in the United States, you could tell by the behavior of who showed up there, various US leaders, as well as George Gao, the CDC director of China, that it was a serious meeting, because the virus was already out. This was mainly a



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

meeting to try to prep people's mindset that a pandemic was coming because indeed it was -- the virus was already out of the lab at that time."

Chapter Two: Lawsuits Against Vaccine Manufacturers – Their Alibis & Defenses

Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) as an Alibi Against Liability

The EUA is a legal mechanism that allows regulatory agencies, such as the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), to authorize the use of medical products, including vaccines, during public health emergencies. It is designed to expedite the availability of treatments, vaccines, and diagnostic tools when there are no adequate, approved, and available alternatives to address the emergency.

Vaccine manufacturers often use the EUA as a defense in legal cases involving injuries or deaths caused by their vaccines. They argue that the vaccine was developed and distributed under government guidance and regulatory standards specific to an emergency situation.

Manufacturers emphasize that the product was deemed necessary to address an urgent public health crisis and that it underwent thorough, albeit expedited, review to ensure it met safety and efficacy benchmarks suitable for emergency use.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Lawsuits Against the COVID-19 AstraZeneca Vaccine

[AstraZeneca Faces Legal Challenge Over COVID-19 Vaccine](#)

AstraZeneca is currently facing a lawsuit filed by Jamie Scott, a man who suffered significant brain injury following his receipt of a COVID-19 vaccine in April 2021. Scott, a father of two, developed a blood clot that led to brain damage, leaving him unable to return to work.

The legal action, brought under the Consumer Protection Act, alleges that the vaccine was "defective" due to its lower-than-expected safety profile. Additionally, around 80 others who claim to have been harmed by the AstraZeneca vaccine are preparing a similar lawsuit, with Scott's case being heard first.

Many of the claimants, including Scott, have received a one-time, tax-free payment of £120,000 through the UK government's Vaccine Damage Payment Scheme (VDPS), which compensates individuals injured by vaccines or their families. However, these claimants argue that the compensation is insufficient, noting that the amount hasn't been updated for inflation since 2007. To be eligible for the VDPS, claimants must demonstrate that the vaccine caused a disability of at least 60%.

Scott, aged 44, received the AstraZeneca vaccine in April 2021. His wife, Kate Scott, has spoken out about the devastating impact of his condition, which has caused memory issues, aphasia, severe headaches, blindness, and the need for extensive rehabilitation.

[Patients Launch Legal Action against AstraZeneca over its COVID-19 Vaccine](#)

Dozens of patients and their families have initiated legal action against AstraZeneca, following severe side effects from its COVID-19 vaccine. Lawyers

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

representing around 75 claimants have sent pre-action protocol letters to AstraZeneca, marking the first step in their legal pursuit.

The plaintiffs, some of whom have lost loved ones and others who have survived catastrophic injuries, are seeking compensation for conditions linked to blood clots and low platelet levels. These claimants have been diagnosed with vaccine-induced thrombotic thrombocytopenia (VITT).

The legal action is being pursued under two fronts: the Consumer Protection Act 1987, which requires claimants to demonstrate that the vaccine was not as safe as the public reasonably expected, and the government's Vaccine Damage Payment Scheme.

Although the scheme has already compensated some individuals, it is limited to a maximum of £120,000 per claim and requires applicants to prove severe disability. Despite this, receiving payment through the scheme does not prevent claimants from pursuing further personal injury claims in court.

Peter Todd, a consultant solicitor involved in the case, highlighted the severity of the complications, which include stroke, heart failure, and leg amputations. He described the technology behind the AstraZeneca vaccine as "risky."

Lawsuits Against the COVID-19 Pfizer Vaccine

[Kansas Accuses Pfizer of Misleading Public About COVID Vaccine in Lawsuit](#)

On 17 June 2024, the state of Kansas filed a lawsuit against Pfizer, alleging the company **misled the public about the safety and effectiveness of its COVID-19 vaccine.**



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

The lawsuit accuses Pfizer of violating the Kansas Consumer Protection Act by **making false claims and withholding critical information about potential risks**. Kansas is seeking monetary damages, the amount of which has not been specified.

Kansas Attorney General Kris Kobach stated that Pfizer deliberately misrepresented the vaccine's safety during a critical time when Americans relied on accurate information. The lawsuit claims that Pfizer concealed evidence linking the vaccine to complications such as miscarriage and heart inflammation conditions like myocarditis and pericarditis, beginning shortly after the vaccine's release in early 2021.

The lawsuit also accuses Pfizer of **exaggerating the vaccine's effectiveness against emerging variants and falsely claiming it could prevent both illness and transmission**.

[Attorney General Ken Paxton Sues Pfizer for Misrepresenting COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy and Conspiring to Censor Public Discourse](#)

Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton has filed a lawsuit against Pfizer, accusing the pharmaceutical company of misrepresenting the effectiveness of its COVID-19 vaccine.

The lawsuit claims that Pfizer violated the *Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act (DTPA)*, a law designed to protect consumers from false, misleading, or deceptive business practices. This law allows individuals, businesses, or the state to take legal action against companies that engage in prohibited conduct, including misrepresentation of a product's benefits, quality, or characteristics, omissions of important facts, and unfair practices that cause financial harm.

The lawsuit alleges various forms of deceptive practices. One potential claim involves misrepresentation of the vaccine's efficacy or safety. Pfizer may have



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

overstated the effectiveness of its COVID-19 vaccine or downplayed known risks and adverse effects.

Another area of concern is incomplete or misleading advertising, where marketing materials omitted key information such as limitations or potential side effects of the vaccine.

The lawsuit also raises the issue of data concealment, asserting that Pfizer failed to disclose unfavorable trial results or adverse events that occurred after the vaccine's release. This could have left consumers and healthcare providers with insufficient information to make fully informed decisions about the vaccine.

Additionally, the case may argue that Pfizer used pressure tactics or fear-based messaging, leveraging fears of illness or death to push sales and implying that their product was the only effective solution.

Warner Mendenhall

"We've dealt with all aspects of COVID litigation. There are, at this point, 16,000 cases nationwide that deal with some aspect of the COVID crisis, and my firm, which is just a small firm in Ohio, has been involved with everything from the lockdowns, the education mandates, the employer mandates.

Our premier case, I would have to say, is the lawsuit against Pfizer under the False Claims Act representing whistleblower Brook Jackson. We are alleging in that case that there was fraud in the clinical trials and that they falsified data showing the shots were safe and effective.

Basically, Brook found all kinds of problems at the trial site itself. There were people who were not trained who were doing the injections at the site. The patients were unblinded. It was really kind of a fake trial site.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



There were so many problems that the data coming out of that site is essentially unreliable and should not have been used in evaluating whether or not these shots were safe and effective, and if the data's unreliable, then there's no basis for the FDA to give it emergency use approval.

This was the trial data that was the basis for the emergency use authorization, and had this trial data been analyzed properly, we believe these shots would've never gotten emergency use authorization and that would've had a tremendous impact.

We wouldn't have obviously had the Pfizer so-called vaccine doing all the damage that it's doing now. And Brook really tried very hard to stop this before it was approved. She called the FDA, she blew the whistle on her company, and literally, six hours later she was walked out the door fired. So somehow the FDA informed Pfizer that they had a whistleblower in their midst and got her off the site and out of her job.

She's a clinical trial director. So she had worked for a couple of decades in clinical trials running the trials, making sure they met the protocols, making sure that the data was actually good data that we were basing decisions on. So she knew exactly when she went into this site that there were all kinds of problems.

She's protected actually and all whistleblowers are protected, so she's protected under the Federal False Claims Act. We have a lawsuit first against Pfizer for the fraud. We want to recover the billions and billions of dollars that Pfizer has been paid for these shots because they basically lied about the trial data and now people are dying because of that lie, so we want to recover all of that money. It's basically recovering it for the US taxpayer because those are taxpayer dollars.

Then the second part of the lawsuit is because Brook Jackson was fired for whistleblowing, we would like to get a recovery for her for her employment damages.

Really, there's no justification at all basically. They walked her out the door immediately. I mean, let's put it this way. They're not worried about whatever her employment damages are. I mean, Pfizer has made \$100 billion off of this product so one individual's employment damages are nothing. They don't care whether she was fired improperly or not. They just wanted her offsite as quickly as possible.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

There are whistleblowers throughout the United States coming forward. A lot of that is thanks to Brook Jackson. I can tell you that she is personally being contacted by whistleblowers from throughout the world, really. But I'm a US lawyer, so I'm mainly focused on United States issues.

But we have whistleblowers that are showing us that the manufacturing practices are bad. We have no idea based on their testimony. They're saying we don't know what's in the vials themselves, so there's no consistency. There's no standards that are being followed in the manufacturing.

First of all, we don't know what's in the vials, and secondly, what's in the vial when it goes into the human body, we don't know what it's going to do for any individual. There's no individualized assessment as to whether you should get this or not.

Obviously, we have 3 million disabled from the shot. We have at least half a million dead from the shot, so something has gone very badly wrong here. If you think about it, the FDA was founded on that idea that whatever you would buy, there would be a label.

You knew what was in it, you knew how much of whatever it was was in it, and you knew what the impact of it was on the human body. With this stuff, we don't know any of that stuff.

There was a threshold condition for Pfizer to get paid, and it was simply to get the EUA. As long as they got that EUA, then they were able to enter into this contract with the Department of Defense, so they did whatever they could to get the EUA.

I think that what we're alleging, the falsification of data, whatever it took, they wanted to get it past the EUA, because that triggered payment of tax dollars in the billions to Pfizer, and they got the EUA, and then those payments started coming.

But if you look at the contract, one of the things that they were supposed to deliver was a safe and effective drug that stopped transmission. What do we all know about that drug now? It doesn't stop any transmission and it's not safe and it's not effective. That's



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



the basis of our case is that they didn't deliver what the Department of Defense wanted to have delivered.

I'm going to simplify it a great deal, but essentially the benefits have to exceed the risks in the data. They had what they call the so-called vaccine arm and the placebo arm, and initially, the data that was presented to the FDA showed that the vaccine arm had a better health outcome than the placebo arm does.

But it's not too hard to see right now that all-cause mortality in the vax arm went up. It was much higher than the placebo arm, and the numbers of people who got COVID, if you look at the overall data, was about the same in the vaccine arm versus the placebo arm.

That data was basically massaged before it went to the FDA to try to show effectiveness, but if you just look at the raw data, the number of people who got COVID in each arm of the trial was about the same. But they massaged that data in order to make it look like it was "90% to 95%" effective. But when you go back and look at it, it clearly was not.

I think this is something that maybe people are thinking that the courts are not on our side. I think there's a general impression that the courts are not on our side, but I want people to look at all the headlines that have come out. We are winning. We're winning all over this country. Biden has been shot down with the OSHA mandates, the federal employee mandate, all of that stuff.

The only mandate that was upheld was the CMS mandate. The military mandate was shot down. The masking on planes was shot down. They're called Article Three courts because they come out of Article Three of the Constitution.

The Article Three courts have actually been performing their role marvelously. It's not perfect. I mean, we all wish for perfection, but they're there. The power of the courts and the power of our tripartite form of government, the genius of our constitutional government is we're seeing it at play, salvaging our Constitution and salvaging our republic."



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Chapter Three: Silencing Truth: How Mass Media & the Government Suppressed Information

Government-imposed Control and Censorship

[Government Censors Victims of COVID Vaccine Injuries. NCLA is Fighting Back](#)

The New Civil Liberties Alliance (NCLA) is spearheading a lawsuit (*Dressen, et al. v. Flaherty*), which challenges actions by the federal government and Stanford University in **monitoring and censoring discussions about COVID vaccines**, including those in support groups for individuals affected by vaccine injuries.

A [newly released video](#) highlights how this censorship campaign has unlawfully suppressed the voices of NCLA's clients, including Brianne Dressen, Nikki Holland, and Ernest Ramirez, violating their fundamental constitutional rights.

Brianne Dressen, who participated in AstraZeneca's vaccine trials, suffered severe injuries from the vaccine. Nikki Holland, a physical therapist, was hospitalized and placed on a ventilator after her COVID-19 vaccination, enduring numerous health issues and now relying on a wheelchair. Ernest Ramirez's son, Ernest, Jr., tragically passed away from cardiac arrest just five days after receiving the Pfizer vaccine.

These individuals, along with other NCLA clients, have turned to social media to share their experiences and connect with support groups. However, **their efforts have been hindered by the coordinated censorship efforts of government agencies which aim to silence their stories.**



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

NCLA's clients report that their personal posts on vaccination experiences are routinely flagged, removed, or suppressed, even in private forums, forcing them to use coded language to avoid detection. Such actions, orchestrated by government entities in collaboration with social media companies, directly conflict with First Amendment protections against governmental interference with free expression.

[The White House COVID Censorship Machine](#)

Recently disclosed documents reveal the **White House's significant involvement in influencing social media companies to censor American citizens.**

Email correspondence between Rob Flaherty, the White House's digital media director, and executives from various social media platforms highlights the administration's persistent and forceful efforts to enforce COVID-19 censorship policies. These policies were not voluntary measures by the companies but were under heavy pressure from the government.

In March 2021, Flaherty contacted a Facebook executive, accusing the platform of failing to address vaccine hesitancy. The pressure extended beyond Facebook. Flaherty also engaged with Google, criticizing YouTube for contributing to vaccine hesitancy and demanding further actions to suppress content contrary to government narratives.

This campaign created an environment where Americans were exposed primarily to government-endorsed narratives about COVID-19. Scientists and experts who voiced alternative, evidence-based perspectives were silenced, including two plaintiffs in the Missouri lawsuit.

The emails demonstrate a clear pattern: government representatives demanded censorship, and social media companies complied by adjusting their policies to align with these demands.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

[Information Isolation: Censoring the COVID-19 Outbreak](#)

Censoring Information Contrary to the Narrative


To suppress unfavorable health statistics, critical reporting, and other COVID-19-related content, governments in at least 28 of the 65 countries evaluated by *Freedom on the Net* took significant measures, such as **blocking websites or forcing users, social media platforms, and online outlets to remove information.**

Censorship was more strict, organized, and comprehensive in China. The Chinese government swiftly moved to control the global narrative by censoring millions of posts containing over 2,000 keywords related to the pandemic. This extended not only to criticisms of the Chinese Communist Party but **even to harmless queries or observations about the virus.**

Furthermore, online news outlets were heavily restricted, ordered to avoid publishing from unofficial sources and avoid any coverage on sensitive topics, including physician Li Wenliang—the whistleblower from Wuhan whose death in early February prompted rare nationwide demands for free speech.

Following China's example, **Bangladeshi authorities resorted to intimidation.** Military intelligence officials warned the mother of Netra News's editor against publishing anything that could "tarnish" the country's image. Journalists were also physically attacked by politicians tied to the ruling party after questioning irregularities in the distribution of government aid during lockdowns.

Egypt also implemented harsh measures to suppress dissenting COVID-19 coverage. The Supreme Council for Media Regulation ordered the blocking of multiple news outlets, including Darb. It was targeted after it reported on health conditions in prisons and advocated for the release of detainees.





BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Imprisoning the Opposition

In at least 45 out of 65 nations, activists, journalists, and even ordinary citizens were **detained or faced criminal charges for online posts related to COVID-19.**

For instance, in Zimbabwe, emergency provisions have exposed internet users to severe penalties, including up to **20 years in prison, for sharing purportedly false information about the pandemic.** At least three individuals have faced such penalties after sharing information about lockdowns on WhatsApp.

Leigh Dundas

"A bunch of army colonels, lieutenant colonels, who are US Army flight surgeons and doctors, obviously, reached out and they said, we've got a problem here because we have access to a database where they track all of the incidents of disease, right? So they're the doctors for the army or the military. And rank and file soldiers come in and they have a sore throat, or they have erectile dysfunction, or they have breast cancer, or they have whatever's going on with them, right? It's tracked.

And it's given a code. There's ICD-10 codes. And this is not a military thing, this is everywhere. You go into your dermatologist's office and you say that you have a freckle that looks funny and they take it off. That's got its own ICD-10 code. If you go get an eye procedure done, it's got its own ICD-10 code for whatever that problem was with your eye.

So what they had done is they had looked at the DOD database and they had recognized that over the preceding 5 years, all of the incidents of disease and problems medically in the military combined totaled about 1.7 million cases per year, on average. And it was a little bit different every year, 1.72, 1.75, 1.7.

But it was coming in every single year like clockwork, 1.7, 1.7, 1.7. And that was true all the way through even the COVID year of 2020. So, 2020 and the bad problem with

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



COVID, even that did not cause any increase over the very, very consistent baseline of 1.7, right?

And then they introduced the vaccine to our armed forces in January of 2021. And thank God it was in January, because it made for a clean break, right on the calendar year cusp, right? So they introduced this vaccine to the US military, saying they have to take it starting in January of 2021.


And when these doctors looked in the database, just in the first 9 or 10 months, so the first 3 quarters really, not even a full year, the incidents of disease, my friend, had gone from 1.7 million on average, to 22 million almost. It was a 20 million increase. It was out of this world statistical hike in the rate of disease in the U.S. military.

And these doctors were horrified. They were horrified. They're like, "Wow, our Department of Defense is using our military as guinea pigs." And these were doctors who'd already fought their corner. They'd gone into their superior and said, why are we giving out the vaccine?

This thing never could clear the animal trials. We skipped the human trials on it. Why are we giving it to our best and brightest that are keeping our country safe? And the answer when one of the lieutenant colonels went into her boss was, "That's right, soldier. You're going to go back to your office and you're going to give this vaccine out, and you're going to get the data that we're missing." Basically, go experiment on your own men and women.

So those are the answers they've been getting. And then they delivered this vaccine, and then they're seeing a catastrophic, I mean, you can't call it anything less than that, fallout in terms of the numbers and how injured these people are. And they were seeing it in their offices. They're having army rangers come in, who are 4% body fat. I mean, just perfect physical specimens who can no longer do a flight of stairs.

They can't even get up a flight of stairs now. And this is going on over and over. They're in helicopters and they're turning their rotors off. They're turning the blades off mid-flight, and the helicopters dropping out of the sky at a base, right? And they interview the guy and they're like, "Why did you do that? Your job is to fly the helicopter,





BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

not turn it off mid-flight and watch it fall out of the sky." And the guy is so brain-fogged and incapable of functioning. He's like, "I don't know", right?

I mean, you have 5 times deployed guys who have Purple Hearts and Bronze Stars, and are themselves flight surgeons who have severe side effects they've already experienced from the 2 vaccines they got, the Pfizer vaccines, right?

Their heart muscle's dying, or they're having other issues with their brain that is actually discernible on objective tests. You run these guys through a cardiac MRI, you put them through imaging of their brain, of their heart, and they're showing, yeah, pieces of these parts of their body that they need, like their brain and their heart are now dead. Well, what's that attributable to? The vaccine, right?

And yet when these guys go in and they say, "Okay, this soldier needs a cardiac MRI", or "This soldier needs an EKG", or "This soldier needs an MRI of this body part or this thing, to get to the bottom of the vaccine injury we're seeing".

They're being told, "You're not going to give that soldier that test, and you're not going to report this as a vaccine adverse event." That's a problem. It's a problem not just because these are the men and women we should be treating the best, because they have been deployed to hellacious war zones and kept our country safe, and not in war by fighting wars on other borders.

But also because they've earned it, right? They've earned our care. And now you're going dishonorably discharge the guys who don't want these very, very harmful vaccines and deprive them and their kids of their rights to their veterans benefits, of their rights to healthcare, of their ability to go to college on the GI bill. The hell, you say. How dare you treat our military like this?

And this hits close to home to me because my husband was in the US Army. He was an officer in the US Army at the age of 19. He was a US Army tanker. He was in the reserves. My father was in the US Navy. My husband's father was in the US Air Force. My grandfather was standing on the deck of the USS West Virginia on December 7th, 1941 when it was bombed out from under him.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



You treat these boys and girls good because they're the reason you get to go to bed on a nice, safe, fluffy pillow every night. How dare you use them as guinea pigs, and how dare you not treat them right once you use them as a lab rat and you start realizing this thing is a kill shot, it is a death shot. It is harming them by the tens of thousands.

So we outed, these brave colonels who were seeing this disease, this injury, not just subjectively on the ground when they were getting people coming through their office who could no longer do a flight of stairs when they were an army ranger the day before they got the vaccine. But now they're looking at the numbers and they're realizing this is not an isolated occurrence in their own medical office at one fort. This is a military-wide problem.

So I pulled in Tom Renz, and we went over to Senator Johnson's office and we had a little meeting right there that you were part of. And we outed the data on behalf of these whistle-blowers. And we're continuing to work with these whistle-blowers to get the data out and to keep them safe for having blown the whistle. And you've got to hand it to these guys. They're risking everything they have.

They're risking their medical license, they're risking their military career. These are men and women, some of them, like I said, Purple Hearts, Bronze Stars. And they're putting 100% of that on the line to do the right thing, and we've got to have their back. And so we're trying, we're trying.

And it's having a response, I'll tell you this, because the DOD went in there after we had that little 'come to Jesus' meeting with Senator Johnson and put this on the record in Washington DC a few weeks ago, and now the DOD is what I would contend apparently falsifying, allegedly, it looks like falsifying data, because now they're saying, 'Oh, we just didn't report all the data for the preceding five years. So here's another 20 million on diseases and cases of disease in those preceding 5 years.' I'm sorry.

You're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't. You've got a problem if your database is that out of whack for 5 years. But it wasn't out of whack. Let's call a spade a spade. You're falsifying data in all likelihood right now to try to bury the evidence of



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

what happened after you introduced the vaccine. And that's a problem, and we're going to get to the bottom of it."

Chapter Four: Judicial Victory – Court Decisions Against Vaccine Mandates

[U.S. Supreme Court Votes AGAINST OSHA Rule: The Mandatory Vaccine Rule](#)

What is the OSHA Emergency Rule?

The OSHA (*Occupational Safety & Health Administration*) Emergency Rule, introduced by the Biden administration in November 2021, was an attempt to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 in the workplace.

The rule **required businesses with 100 or more employees to ensure their workers were either fully vaccinated or subject to weekly COVID-19 testing.** Employees who were not vaccinated were required to wear masks at work.

Non-Compliance Resulted in Termination of Employment

Under the OSHA Emergency Rule, employees who did not comply with the vaccination or testing requirements faced disciplinary action, which could include losing their jobs.

While the rule itself did not mandate termination, it required businesses to enforce the vaccination or testing policies. **For those employees who refused to comply with the requirements, many employers considered disciplinary measures, including suspension or termination,** especially if the employees failed to provide proof of vaccination or comply with the regular testing and masking guidelines.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

What Did the US Supreme Court Decide?

The US Supreme Court ruled on January 13, 2022, to block a key COVID-19 vaccine mandate issued by the Biden administration for large businesses. In a 6-3 decision, the Court determined that OSHA did not have the authority under the Occupational Safety and Health Act to implement such sweeping requirements.

The justices emphasized that COVID-19 was a general risk, not one confined to specific workplaces, and therefore fell outside the scope of OSHA's regulatory power.

In sum, the Supreme Court ruled that the federal government, through OSHA, **does not have the authority to mandate COVID-19 vaccinations for employees of large businesses**. COVID-19 is not specific enough to be considered a workplace hazard that OSHA can regulate. Therefore, mandatory vaccinations could not be required by OSHA for large employers.

Why Workers Fired for Refusing COVID Vaccines are Starting to Win in Court

In San Francisco, a city known for its high COVID-19 vaccination rates, a federal jury recently awarded over \$7.8 million to six former Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) employees who were **terminated for refusing COVID-19 vaccinations on religious grounds**.

Plaintiffs in these lawsuits argue that employers violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by failing to accommodate their religious beliefs. Many claim they could have continued working under alternative measures, such as masking, regular testing, or remote work. Employers, however, contend that granting such exemptions would impose undue hardship and jeopardize workplace safety.

In the BART case, the plaintiffs proposed creative solutions to remain compliant while honoring their beliefs, such as wearing full hazmat suits or working alone

The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking towards the camera. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, the personification of the law, holding a scale of justice and a sword.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

while masked. Despite these offers, BART argued that accommodating unvaccinated employees would disrupt operations and create unnecessary burdens.

Queensland Supreme Court Declared Certain C-19 Vaxx Mandates Unlawful

What was the Case About?

The case revolved around **COVID-19 vaccine mandates imposed on Queensland police officers, ambulance workers, and a nurse**. These mandates, introduced by Queensland Police Commissioner Katarina Carroll and then Queensland Health Director-General John Wakefield, required employees in these roles to receive COVID-19 vaccinations by specified deadlines as a condition of their employment.

Non-compliance could result in disciplinary action, including dismissal. A group of employees affected by these mandates brought the case to the Queensland Supreme Court, seeking a declaration that the mandates were unlawful. Although the mandates had been revoked by the time the case was heard, the plaintiffs pursued the matter to address broader concerns about the legality of such directives.

The plaintiffs argued that the mandates violated human rights and exceeded the powers granted to the officials who imposed them.

The Main Issue Presented

Whether the COVID-19 vaccine mandates for Queensland police officers and ambulance workers were lawfully implemented within the bounds of legal authority and human rights considerations?



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

How did the High Court Rule?

The Queensland Supreme Court **ruled that the COVID-19 vaccine mandate for police officers was unlawful** because the police commissioner failed to adequately consider the human rights implications of the policy.

Justice Glenn Martin found it "more likely than not" that the commissioner did not take into account the potential human rights ramifications, particularly under Queensland's Human Rights Act, which includes the right not to be subjected to medical treatment without full, free, and informed consent.

For ambulance service workers, the court found the vaccine mandates unlawful on a different basis.

The director-general of Queensland Health lacked the authority to impose the mandate under employment and contract law. The director-general argued that the mandate was a lawful and reasonable direction implied by employment contracts but failed to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate this. Consequently, the court determined that the mandates for ambulance workers exceeded the director-general's legal powers.

Graham Hood

"What led up to me resigning over the vaccine mandates? I took the pandemic seriously when it first happened. I believe that there was some risk there. I'd always been a middle-of-the-road kind of guy. I'd never rocked the boat. I'd always paid my taxes and abided by the laws, and I was completely perplexed at the rapid pace of vaccine rollout, the lack of proper due diligence in regards to implementing these programs, and I found myself ready to go for Pfizer.

I've given permission to the nursing home to give my mom Pfizer, and I said to my boss one day, "Look, I'll have Pfizer, but I won't have AstraZeneca." And since then, of course, AstraZeneca has been pulled. It wasn't safe and effective, but it had been out there, been pumped into people's arms for years now.



BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



And I said, "I'll get the Pfizer." And my wife overheard me make the call, and when I hung up from the phone, she said to me, "Have you done any research? You're getting the vaccine." And I said, "No. I haven't really. I'm just trusting the government." She said, "Would you trust the government to do a safety inspection on your airplane?" I said, "No." She said, "Well, hadn't you better do some research?"

And within four hours, I'd done enough research through mainstream to realize that there was no way that I could give informed consent because there was no legitimate information to base that consent on. It was all hearsay and speculation, and now I know most of it was fraud. So I thought to myself, "Would I fly an airplane with an experimental fuel full of passengers from one side of the continent to another without it being properly tested?"

And the answer was, "No." So I contacted my boss, and I said, "Look, I'm really skeptical about this." I decided before I contacted him to talk to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority, the governing body, our version of the FAA in Australia, and I asked them some basic questions. I spoke to their medical examiners, and I said, "Can you tell me what the long-term side effects are?"

And they said, "Well, no." "What about short-term side effects?" "Well, not really." "Will I pass my medical every six months if I have this injection?" "Well, we don't know." "And has it been tested at high altitude with airline crews?" "Not that we're aware of." So I said, "You can't tell me anything."

And then I called the Qantas medical officer, the chief medical officer, and I put the same questions to him and got the same responses. I then spoke to three GPs, two whom I had a professional relationship with, and one whom I had a social relationship with.

And all three said the same thing in so many words, and I paraphrased by saying, "If I were you, I wouldn't rush into this, but don't tell anyone I told you." When I heard them say, "Don't tell anyone I told you," the hair stood up on the back of my neck because why wouldn't you be able to tell me the truth?"

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups




I have a doctor-patient relationship with you, and they said, "Well, if we tell you what we know, then we could be struck off," so that got me really fired up. And at the end of a couple of days of research, I decided that Qantas had come out and said that they were going to mandate for all employees, which was ludicrous. None of the mandates made sense. The social distancing didn't make sense. The masking didn't make sense. None of it made sense.

The border closures made no sense. People weren't allowed to cross borders. You couldn't go and visit a dying relative. Some parents were locked away from their children who were dying in hospital of leukemia. None of it made sense. And I was incensed by that. I've always had a strong sense of social justice.

And having made many inquiries through the company to see if there was any chance they were going to drop the mandates or back off for a while until we had some more information, I realized that they were set on this course of action, and I then realized that I had to do something about it. I went onto a Zoom video call with 300 concerned aviators, many of whom were deeply depressed. They knew they shouldn't be taking the jab, but they knew if they didn't, they'd lose their careers and they wanted to be pilots like I did since they were five years of age. Their whole career, their whole life was about to be flushed down the toilet.

And I realized that I was the oldest pilot still working in the ranks, and I said, "Well, look, I've had my career. I've still got a couple of years to go, but you guys are halfway through or just starting. I need to fall on my sword and sacrifice my career to bring this to a head because I can't live with myself if I don't."

So I made a video that was 27 minutes. I was putting my uniform on for the last time, and I didn't script it. I just spoke from the heart, and I did it in one take, and I went down to the garden where my wife was doing some gardening with the iPad, and I showed it to her, and I said, "What do you think?" And when she'd finished watching it, she said, "What are you going to do with this?" And I said, "Well, I didn't make it for nothing." She said, "Do you need to send it out there?" And I said, "I do." And she said, "You know what, honey? You are who you are, and that's why I married you, and I don't want you to compromise any of that for us."





BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups



I said, "If I do this, it'll end our dream." And our dream is to complete a mission property here, a retreat property where we deal with the adult victims of childhood sexual abuse and people who are depressed and anxious, and we needed to keep working for two years to get that finished.

She said, "Honey, I don't care if we end up with nothing, even if we're living in a tent as long as we've got each other, so you need to put it out there," and I did. And I thought it was only going to be put out to I guess company people. I was very naive about social media. I gave it to somebody to put it out there thinking- All I wanted to do was divert the course of action by the Qantas Board and the chief executive.

And within nine hours of giving it to my friend to post on social media, it had had 7 million views around the world, and my whole life changed, completely changed. The messages, I was getting 30,000 messages in the first day all telling me that, "Thank God, you spoke up." "You're telling my story." "Please, don't stop." "We need people like you to keep talking."

And I realized that many of the people I was talking to were suicidal. They were on the edge that they could see their whole life going down the toilet. They either kept their dreams alive, or they died, and it was all for something that had a 99.8% survival rate, and none of it made sense to me. So ever since then, I've been forging ahead. I have been one of the major voices in Australia fighting mandates.

I've seen tens of thousands of people who've lost their jobs, their homes, their families. People won't talk to them anymore. There's a new subcaste in Australia called the anti-vaxxers, and I have been fighting as hard as I can for them because I actually realized in the last four years how much I love the people in this country, even the people who don't like me.

And I believe that God calls us to be loving and compassionate but stand for justice as well. And we've been doing an awful lot of work since then and are very grateful for what God has shown us and very grateful for the wonderful people that we've met. And I've come to realize that the kick in the butt that Australia has had in the last four years was desperately needed in order for us to get our priorities right and to refocus on life."

The top banner image is split into two parts. The left part shows a person lying in a hospital bed, looking towards the camera. The right part shows a statue of Lady Justice, holding scales and a sword.

BURIED TRUTHS

The Legal Fight Against Vaccine Injury Coverups

Conclusion

The ongoing lawsuits against major vaccine manufacturers like Pfizer and AstraZeneca reveal that there are indeed issues and problems surrounding the COVID-19 vaccine and that they are not as '*safe and effective*' as they were advertised to be.

These cases are still pending in courts across our nation and several foreign countries. Under the pressure of legal scrutiny, these companies have started to admit to the severe side effects and injuries caused by their vaccines.

Millions of people were neither given a comprehensive disclosure of the potential risks and benefits nor provided a real choice. Instead, many were coerced into vaccination by the threat of losing their jobs, access to education, or other essential rights.

As these truths come to light, the narrative of the pandemic response is being rewritten. The suppression of alternative treatments, the silencing of dissenting voices, and the deliberate control of information by government bodies and mass media contributed to a culture of fear and compliance.

The fight for justice and accountability is far from over. These legal battles are a step toward exposing the truth and holding those responsible to account. However, they also serve as a stark reminder of the need for vigilance and critical thinking in times of crisis. If there is a lesson to be drawn from this dark chapter, it is that the public must demand transparency, protect informed consent, and ensure that future public health measures are rooted in science, ethics, and respect for individual rights.